

Page 2: Information about the person or organisation completing this submission

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

Ian K Hamilton

**Q2** Are you making this submission

as a registered practitioner

**Q3** Please tell us which part of the sector your submission represents

a registered dentist or dental specialist

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

**Q4** What, if anything, do you like about our proposed core recertification programme?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q5** Is there anything about our proposed core recertification programme you would change?

**Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
The whole concept is overly complicated. You claim to know which practitioners have complaints against them. Surely these are the people you need to concentrate on helping to improve their deficiencies. The large numbers of practitioners who never have complaints against them are obviously satisfying their patients and don't need their hands held .

**Q6** Do you support our proposal to change the recertification cycle to 12 months?

**No,**  
Please explain.:  
If your competence has not been called to account constant recertification is an unnecessary and needless bureaucratic hurdle

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**Q7** Do you think our proposed core recertification programme should include a requirement for practitioners to complete an online open-book assessment of their technical and clinical knowledge and skills?

**No,**

Please explain.:

These are self evident for a competent dentist. Writing a book helps no one. Who is going to look at it and judge whether it is acceptable.

**Q8** If a proposal about an online open-book assessment of a practitioner's technical and clinical skills and knowledge is supported, how often should practitioners be required to complete an assessment?

**Every five years** ,

Please explain.:

It should never be needed.

**Q9** Do you have other proposals about our proposed core recertification programme you would like us to consider? Please explain.

As mentioned above why burden all practitioners with time consuming recertification requirements when no one complains about them.

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

**Q10** What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for supporting new registrants?

Probably overprotective. Unless you are allowed to practice what you have been taught how can you learn starting out a professional career?

**Q11** Is there anything about the draft proposals for supporting new registrants you would change?

**Yes**

**Q12** Do you think the proposed two year minimum period for the mentoring relationship is:

**too long** ,

Please explain.:

If you haven't developed any confidence after a year of practice perhaps you should reconsider your choice of career

**Q13** Do you think all new registrants should participate in a mentoring programme, or are there some new registrants who should not be required to participate in a mentoring programme?

**No,**

Please explain.:

Some won't need mentoring if they are confident.

**Q14** Do you have other proposals about supporting new registrants you would like us to consider? Please explain.

**Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 5: Area three: addressing health-related competence decline concerns

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**Q15** What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns?

Most people are self aware enough to recognize if their skills are deteriorating. Some won't be.

---

**Q16** Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would change? **No**

---

**Q17** Do you have other proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would like us to consider? Please explain. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

---

Page 6: Area four: addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours

**Q18** What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours?

De- register them.

---

**Q19** Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would change? **Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
The threat of de-registration is not enough. It should be carried through.

---

**Q20** Do you have other proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would like us to consider? Please explain. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

---

Page 7: Final thoughts and comments

**Q21** Do you have any other comments, suggestions or information you want to share with us about the draft proposals for improving our approach to recertification? **Respondent skipped this question**

---